

Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-10/msg00724.html>

- *From:* "Androcles" <Androcles@ MyPlace.org>
 - *Date:* Thu, 13 Oct 2005 22:41:26 GMT
-

"John Kennaugh" <JKNG@xx> wrote in message news:y+V46iPGmsTDFwr6@xx

| Randy Poe wrote:

| >

| >John Kennaugh wrote:

| >> The following is faulty logic –

| >> 'I see X therefore it is X while ballistic theory says that if it is X I

| >> should see Y. I don't see Y therefore ballistic theory is wrong.

| >>

| >> The logic is faulty because a 1:1 relationship has been assumed.

| >>

| >> Equally faulty is if one assumes ballistic theory is right:

| >> 'I see X but it isn't really X it is Z and if we assume it is Z and

| >> apply BaT corrections we would expect to see X. We do see X therefore

| >> Bat is correct.'

| >

| >The issue is a lot simpler than that.

| >

| >Henri is claiming BaT can cause a parallax measure to be X

| >when it is Z which is significantly different from X. You are assuming

| >that BaT can in fact make that prediction. He has not so far

| >produced an argument showing that the parallax can be Z but

| >be measured as X. All he does is say over and over that it

| >does.

|

| I cannot say I have been following it that closely. They were banging on

| at each other before I went on holiday they were still banging on when I

|

| got back and a month later they are still banging on. I cannot see why

| either of them bother but I was at least trying to standardise their

| terminology.

|

| If you study the history of relativity then one can but conclude that

| the chances of it being true are not very high.

[quote]

we establish by definition that the "time" required by a turtle to travel from A to B equals the "time" it requires to travel from B to A.

[end quote]

Ref: <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>

[quote]

For velocities greater than that of a turtle our deliberations become meaningless; we shall, however, find in what follows, that the velocity of a turtle in our theory plays the part, physically, of an infinitely great velocity.

[quote]

Ref: <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>

Nothing can go faster than a turtle.

Oops!... Did I say 'a turtle'? Sorry... 'light'.

Same phuckwit math, though.

| Einstein tried to

| improve on Lorentz's theory and failed so in effect modern physics is based upon Lorentz's 'fix' of Maxwell's ether theory. Unfortunately that

| 'fix' only covers the first failure of Maxwell's theory, MMX, it does nothing to fix the other two, the ultraviolet catastrophe and the fact that lumps of light can knock electrons out of metal even when few in number.

Much worse, John. It denies an axiom, the Principle of Relativity.

<http://www.bartleby.com/173/7.html>

Comments in square brackets are mine.

"Albert Einstein (1879–1955). Relativity: The Special and General Theory. 1920.

The Apparent Incompatibility of the Law of Propagation of Light with the Principle of Relativity.

THERE is hardly a simpler law in physics than that according to which light is propagated in empty space [except the Principle of Relativity, a really simple law].

Every child at school knows, or believes he knows, that this

[Harry Potter]

propagation takes place in straight lines with a velocity

$c = 300,000 \text{ km./sec}$

[relative to the source, but cosmic muons can win that race by a mile, literally. Einstein seems to have forgotten he said "we shall, however, find in what follows, that the velocity of light in our theory plays the part, physically, of an infinitely great velocity"].

Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.

At all events we know with great exactness that this velocity is the same for all colours, because if this were not the case [prisms would split white light into different colours and we never see that, and]

the minimum of emission would not be observed simultaneously for different colours during the eclipse of a fixed star by its dark neighbour

[except that Algol has no dark neighbour, John Goodricke, 18 years old with a toy telescope in 1782 forgot to include the velocity of light into his calculations and an eclipse means no light at all, not a reduction in magnitude, besides which calculations reveal that such a system is unstable, the "dark neighbour" is at the Roche limit and will break up]

By means of similar considerations based on observations of double stars

[Sirius, 8 light years away with a period of 50 years, <http://www.star.ucl.ac.uk/~apod/apod/ap001006.html> no other double has ever been seen]

the Dutch astronomer De Sitter was also able to show that the velocity of propagation of light cannot depend on the velocity of motion of the body emitting the light

[oh really? how? I see no significant velocity v from Sirius to add to c].

The assumption that this velocity of propagation is dependent on the direction "in space" is in itself improbable

[but factually true. Compare <http://www.ebicom.net/~rsf1/sekerin.htm> (fig 3 with <http://www.britastro.org/vss/gifc/00918-ck.gif> Real scientists don't deal in assumptions and probables or persuasion].

In short, let us assume

[No, I will not assume]

that the simple law

[because Einstein says it is a law]

of the constancy of the velocity of light c (in vacuum) is justifiably believed by the child at school

[who also believes in Santa Claus, but not believed by thinking rational adults].

Who would imagine that this simple law has plunged the conscientiously thoughtful physicist into the greatest intellectual difficulties?

[and solved them, not being a peanut brain like Einstein, it wasn't that difficult]

Let us consider how these difficulties arise

[because Einstein can make up stories] ."

[Skip silly train story]

At this juncture the theory of relativity entered the arena.

(Einstein wants to be famous]

As a result of an analysis of the physical conceptions of time and space,

[insert here this 'analysis' in Einstein's own words]

"we establish by definition that the "time" required by light to travel from A to B equals the "time" it requires to travel from B to A."

[end insert. Some great analysis, that was.]

it became evident that

[Einstein is lying through my teeth]

in reality there is not the least incompatibility between the principle of relativity

[which he hasn't discussed at all]

and the law of propagation of light

[Because Einstein says so, it's a LAW, stomp foot]

and that by systematically holding fast to both these laws a logically [huh?] rigid theory could be arrived at

[such as the speed of light being infinitely great in his theory].

This theory has been called the special theory of relativity

[or the special theory of the excrement of the male bovine]

to distinguish it from the extended theory, with which

we shall deal later.

In the following pages we shall present the fundamental ideas of the special theory of relativity

[but the conscientiously thoughtful physicist isn't taken in by it]."

| Instead of abandoning the Maxwell/Lorentz/Einstein wave-ether theories

| it left them unscathed and spawned a different branch of physics. The

| two branches don't exactly fit comfortably together and attempts to make

| them fit are now in the realms of fantasy or rather string theory with

| its universe with 10 or 26 dimensions.

|

| The alternative was to accept that the wave-ether theory is dead, that

| light is particulate (which has no need of ether), which somehow

| 'behaves like' rather than IS a system of waves. That implies that

light

| is source dependent.

|

| Belief in source independence came from a belief in the ether, it

| survived MMX because Lorentz 'fixed' the ether theory. It survived

| relativity because Einstein was looking for an ether which would give

| symmetry and it avoided criticism because of DeSitters observations of

| double stars which were discredited by Fox in 1965 (or thereabouts).

| That is 260 years of belief in something without credible evidence to

| support it and the only rationale for that belief is now ridiculed

Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.

while

| the belief itself is as firmly entrenched as ever.

|

| I for one am very interested in the BaT alternative and am interested in

| what Henri has to say even though he is far too dogmatic for my liking.

You are barking up the right tree at the wrong squirrel.

| Obviously if you throw every object in the sky at him and demand
| 'explain that then!!!' he won't be able to do so because he has not
the

| resources. To match data in a few cases, which I believe he has, is
| quite an achievement with the resources at his disposal.

By duplicating MY work with MY encouragement?

Some achievement.

You may not like me because I'm impolite, but that's no excuse for crediting Wilson with my achievement.

Yes, I'm proud of Wilson having the courage to duplicate my work, but he's a loose cannon.

|

| The point I would make is this. Walter Ritz, a contemporary of Einstein

| and a heavyweight in the physics world came up with a BaT theory (the
| emission theory) which I believe would have been accepted had it not
| been for the physics establishment's historical bias in favour of
| wave-ether theory's and the fact that Ritz died prematurely in 1909
| leaving Einstein with no opposition. Let us just suppose that it had
| been accepted and had got established. If you believe in relativity
then

| you presumably believe that Ritz's theory would eventually have hit a
| snag. The problem with that is twofold. Firstly if an established
theory

| hits a snag it tends to get 'fixed' (look at BB theory), secondly I
can

| see no route which could possibly lead back to, or converge with what
we

| have now. Had the choice been different we would now have a different
| physics. I would love to know what that different physics might be and
| whether it would make more sense than what we do have.

We are only 5 years into the 21st century. Perhaps we can rectify the
insanity
of the 20th.

Androcles.

Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.

| John Kennaugh
| to email convert the number from hex to decimal

• **References:**

- ◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
 ◇ *From:* Paul B. Andersen
- ◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
 ◇ *From:* Paul B. Andersen
- ◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
 ◇ *From:* Paul B. Andersen
- ◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
 ◇ *From:* John Kennaugh
- ◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
 ◇ *From:* Randy Poe
- ◆ **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
 ◇ *From:* John Kennaugh

- Prev by Date: **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Androcles' and Henri's Theory of Diffraction Grating Behavior](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: GPS 'GR Correction' Myth.](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**